

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Amendments to the Specification and Abstract

The specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised to improve their English grammar. No new matter has been added.

II. Title of the Invention

In accordance with Examiner's request, the title of the invention has been amended. The invention is now titled "INTEGRATED CIRCUIT AND ELECTRIC DEVICE FOR AVOIDING A LATENCY TIME CAUSED BY ACCESS CONTENTION."

III. Amendments to the Claims

New claims 15-19 have been added.

Further, independent claims 1, 8 and 12 have been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the references relied upon in the rejections discussed below. Support for these amendments can be found, at least, in Fig. 1 and paragraphs [0069]-[0074] of the specification.

It is also noted that claims 1-14 have been amended to make a number of editorial revisions thereto. These editorial revisions have been made to place the claims in better U.S. form. Further, these editorial revisions have not been made to narrow the scope of protection of the claims, or to address issues related to patentability, and therefore, these amendments should

not be construed as limiting the scope of equivalents of the claimed features offered by the Doctrine of Equivalents.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Glew. Further, claims 3-5 and 7-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Glew in view of various combinations of Kawakami and the Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 1, 8 and 12 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites an integrated circuit including a bus, a first memory connected to the bus, a first processing unit that accesses the first memory via the bus, a second processing unit that accesses the said first memory via the bus, and performs data processing and/or calculation, in a larger amount than the first processing unit, and a second memory that is accessed by the second processing unit without passing through the bus, such that the second processing unit accesses the second memory without accessing the bus. Further, claim 1 recites that the second processing unit includes at least one of an image input circuit and an image output circuit, such that the image input circuit receives output image data from a first component located outside the integrated circuit, and such that the image output circuit generates video signals for outputting to a second component located outside the integrated circuit.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection relies on Glew for teaching the features of the first and second processing units, as recited in previously presented claim 1. However, in view of the above-identified amendments to claim 1, which clarify the structure of the second processing unit, it is submitted that Glew fails to disclose or

suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features now required by the second processing unit, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Rather, Glew merely teaches that integrated camera/encoder sub-system 20 includes a video processor 23 and a camera 21, such that the video processor 23 receives data from the camera 21 and transmits data to a bus 30 (see Fig. 2 and col. 3, lines 34-55).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Glew teaches that the camera sub-system includes both the video processor and the camera, but fails to disclose or suggest that the second processing unit includes at least one of an image input circuit and an image output circuit, such that the image input circuit receives output image data from a first component located outside the integrated circuit, and such that the image output circuit generates video signals for outputting to a second component located outside the integrated circuit.

In other words, Glew requires the video processor to have a structure such that the camera and the video processor communicate within the same camera sub-system, which is completely different from the structure required by claim 1, such that the image input circuit receives output image data from a first component located outside the integrated circuit, and such that the image output circuit generates video signals for outputting to a second component located outside the integrated circuit.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claim 1 and claims 2 and 6 that depend therefrom are not anticipated by Glew.

Regarding dependent claims 3-7, which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glew in view of various combinations of Kawakami and the AAPA (secondary references), it is respectfully submitted that these secondary references do not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claim 1 which are lacking from

the Glew reference. Therefore, no obvious combination of Glew with any of the secondary references would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claim 1 and claims 2-7 and 15 that depend therefrom.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Glew, Kawakami and/or the AAPA or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Glew, Kawakami and/or the AAPA to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 2-7 and 15 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claims 8 and 12 are directed to an electric device and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 8 and 12 and claims 9-11, 13, 14 and 16-19 are allowable over the prior art of record.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Koji KAI et al.

By /Andrew L. Dunlap/
2010.02.02 14:57:49 -05'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
February 2, 2010